

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-7, and 9 are active. The final rejection of the prior Office Action of October 12, 2007 is withdrawn and a new grounds of rejection is applied to the claims. The drawing is objected to. The disclosure is objected to. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are objected to on formal matters. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 9 rejected under 35 USC 112 first paragr. Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bao in view of Carey_.

The Drawing

The drawing is objected to on the basis that the underlayer and substrate must be shown or the underlayer canceled. The underlayer is canceled from the claims as requested and this basis of the objection to the drawing is met.

The drawing is objected to in that there is no figure 1 legend. Applicants traverse this objection as improper and contrary to the rules and should be withdrawn. Sole figures are not required to have a figure number legend. See Rule 37 CFR 1.84(u)(1)

"Where only a single view is used in an application to illustrate the claimed invention, it must not be numbered and the abbreviation 'FIG.' must not appear." (underlining added)

This basis of the rejection is in error. The objections to the drawing are met and should be withdrawn.

Formal matter rejections of the claims and specification

Claim 4 is rejected as cumulative claiming. This claim is amended accordingly.

Minor amendment is made to certain of the claims in the interest of clarity and consistency and to meet the objections thereto based on formal matters. The disclosure is amended as suggested. Applicants thank the examiner for his constructive comments. Applicants believe that the objections to the claims and specification based on formal matters are met and this basis of the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 and the other claims are amended to meet the objections based on formal matters and no substantive amendments are made to any of the claims. The issues present in the prior response are the same as in the present amended claims submitted herein for reconsideration.

Amended claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claim 1 is rejected as being unpatentable over the article by Bao and Carey '550.

Applicants traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 calls for:

In an electronic organic component, the combination comprising:
a substrate of the electronic component; and
an organic semiconductor functional layer coated on the substrate;

wherein said substrate comprises a biaxially stretched (well-ordered) plastic film such that the orderliness of the plastic film forms the applied functional layer into a well-ordered layer to thereby increase the charge carrier mobility of the coated organic functional layer. (underlining added)

The claimed function (as underlined) of increasing the charge carrier mobility of the coated organic layer could not occur if the semiconductor layer were not contiguous with the substrate. This function was always present in the original claim and thus the semiconductor coated on the substrate means that it is directly on and contiguous with the substrate in order for the claim function to make sense. It is apparent that the Action construes the term “semiconductor on the substrate” does not mean directly on or contiguous with the substrate since the Action cites Bao Fig. 1. Here the semiconductor is not directly on contiguous with the substrate, but is on a polyimide layer, which is not a semiconductor. The polyimide layer in turn is on an ITO gate electrode which is an electrically conductive electrode. This is not a semiconductor, but is directly on and contiguous with the substrate.

The Action erroneously construes the semiconductor of Bao as on the substrate as claimed. But as pointed out above, this is not what is disclosed by Bao as discussed. Applicants’ claim 1 calls for by the semiconductor to be coated “on the substrate.” Applicants do not understand why the Action asserts this is shown by Bao when the Fig. 1 thereof contradicts this conclusion. The claimed function of increasing the charge carrier mobility of the coated organic layer can not occur in Bao even if their substrate were biaxially stretched as claimed or as suggested by the Action, which it is not, as admitted by the Action, since their semiconductor layer is not directly on and contiguous with the substrate as claimed. The semiconductor layer is remote from the

substrate and can not exhibit the claimed properties even if the substrate were as claimed.

The Action states that Bao discloses a substrate in Fig. 1 and an organic semiconductor functional layer which is coated on the substrate. Applicants disagree that Bao discloses a semiconductor organic functional layer coated on a substrate as claimed, in their Fig. 1 as asserted. Fig. 1 thereof plainly shows a polyester substrate on which is a layer of ITO which is an electrically conductive gate electrode. An electrically conductive gate electrode is not a semiconductor. The semiconductor layer is not on or contiguous with the substrate as claimed and thus can not have the claimed properties no matter what the substrate comprises. Applicants are perplexed by this statement in the Action. The examiner is respectfully requested to point at why he arrives at the conclusion otherwise than as shown in the Fig. 1 of this reference. This reference is not relevant to what is claimed.

Carey is cited for teaching that it is known in the art to provide the polyester substrate as biaxially stretched plastic film citing col. 3, lines 36-41 and that such biaxially stretched films are commonly used as a substrate for large area displays (citing col. 2, lines 28-31). The conclusion is then made that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide Bao with the substrate of Carey 2. Applicants also find the citation of this reference even more perplexing. No semiconductor layer is disclosed. The Action merely points to col. 3, lines 36-41 as disclosing a biaxially stretched plastic substrate. The relevancy of this disclosure to what is claimed is not seen.

Carey is not relevant to coating a semiconductor layer on a biaxially stretched plastic substrate. Carey merely discloses a SiO² insulation layer 11 on the substrate 10. An amorphous Si O² layer 12 is on layer 11. 16 is a gate dielectric (an insulator) layer and 17 is an Al gate. There is no semiconductor shown in this reference.

Applicants are at a loss as to what suggests amended claim 1 in these references when both are missing what is claimed. Applicants are not claiming they invented a biaxially stretched plastic substrate. So the point of citing Carey for this disclosure is not relevant. Even if one were to provide the substrate of Carey to the structure of Bao, this still does not suggest what is claimed. That is because even if the substrate of Bao were biaxially stretched plastic film as asserted, what is missing is the coated semiconductor on the substrate which would or could result in the claimed function: The coated semiconductor functional layer on the substrate of a biaxially stretched (well-ordered) plastic film is such that wherein the orderliness of the plastic film forms the applied functional layer into a well-ordered layer to thereby increase the charge carrier mobility of the coated organic functional layer. It is not understood how this latter structure is obvious in view of the two references which do not disclose or suggest such structure missing therefrom.

Applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references of record and find that there is no support therein for the amended claim 1 subject matter.

If the Examiner persists in this rejection he is respectively requested to point out with particularity where there is support for an organic semiconductor layer on a

stretched substrate to perform the function as claimed because applicants can find no such support at the presently designated locations of the cited references. Bits and pieces of what is claimed may be disclosed, but this is insufficient. No enabling disclosure of what is claimed is present. More is required for a showing of obviousness than mere speculative possibilities based on proscribed hindsight review of applicants' disclosure. There is no motivation to do what is claimed in the cited references. Claim 1 is not suggested by the cited references, and is believed allowable thereover.

Method claim 5 includes subject matter similar to claim 1 and is believed allowable for similar reasons.


The remaining claims 2, 4, 6-7, and 9, depend from the independent claims and are believed allowable at least for these reasons as well as the structures or steps claimed therein not shown or suggested by the cited references. These claims are believed allowable.

Since claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9 have been shown to be in proper form for allowance, such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants request a one month extension of time to respond to the Office Action so that the time for response expires on June 14, 2008. The Commissioner is

authorized to charge the extension fee to deposit account 03 0678 or any other fees that may be due for this paper or credit the deposit account for any overpayments in connection with this paper.

Respectfully submitted,
Wolfgang Clemens et al.



by William Squire
Reg. No. 25,378, Attorney for Applicants
Phone: 973-994-1700
Fax: 973-994-1744

303945v6